

THEODORE J. BOUTROUS JR., SBN 132099
tboutrous@gibsondunn.com
RICHARD J. DOREN, SBN 124666
rdoren@gibsondunn.com
DANIEL G. SWANSON, SBN 116556
dswanson@gibsondunn.com
JAY P. SRINIVASAN, SBN 181471
jsrinivasan@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: 213.229.7000
Facsimile: 213.229.7520

VERONICA S. MOYÉ (Texas Bar No.
24000092; *pro hac vice*)
vmoye@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
2100 McKinney Avenue, Suite 1100
Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: 214.698.3100
Facsimile: 214.571.2900

MARK A. PERRY, SBN 212532
mperry@gibsondunn.com
CYNTHIA E. RICHMAN (D.C. Bar No.
492089; *pro hac vice*)
crichman@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202.955.8500
Facsimile: 202.467.0539

ETHAN D. DETTMER, SBN 196046
edettmer@gibsondunn.com
ELI M. LAZARUS, SBN 284082
elazarus@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
555 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: 415.393.8200
Facsimile: 415.393.8306

Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

EPIC GAMES, INC.,

Plaintiff, Counter-
defendant

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant,
Counterclaimant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR-TSH

**BRIEF RE: MOTION TO STRIKE
WRITTEN AND ORAL TESTIMONY OF
DR. MICHAEL I. CRAGG REGARDING
FOREIGN REGULATORY SUBMISSIONS
OF A NON-PARTY**

1 In his written direct testimony (Ex. Expert 13 ¶ 71 & n.10 (Cragg)) and in his oral testimony to
 2 the Court, Epic’s rebuttal economic expert Dr. Michael I. Cragg relied on submissions made by
 3 Spotify—a member of the Coalition for App Fairness—to the Japan Fair Trade Commission (“JFTC”)
 4 for the purpose of advocating for regulatory action against Apple related to some of the same conduct
 5 challenged here. Consistent with the Court’s admonition that “experts do not get to opine without a
 6 factual basis for their opinions,” Trial Tr. 501:25–502:1, counsel for Apple objected when Dr. Cragg
 7 attempted to offer an opinion regarding substitutability in reliance on those submissions. Counsel for
 8 Epic offered the Spotify submissions pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 703 as the evidentiary basis
 9 for Dr. Cragg’s opinions. But written advocacy by a non-party urging a regulator to take action against
 10 a competitor without any opportunity to cross-examine the competitor regarding the reliability or
 11 methodology of the data underlying its advocacy is not the kind of information “experts in the particular
 12 field would reasonably rely on.” Fed. R. Evid. 703. Dr. Cragg’s testimony regarding the Spotify
 13 submissions should be stricken as without factual basis.

14 Although described by Dr. Cragg as an [REDACTED] conducted by Spotify, what Dr. Cragg
 15 actually relies on is two [REDACTED] documents submitted by Spotify to the JFTC in an effort to
 16 persuade the commission to take regulatory action against Apple. See PX-1152; PX-1153. These
 17 documents were neither offered nor received into evidence, and are obviously inadmissible; they may
 18 not be considered or relied on by the Court for any purpose other than to determine that they are not
 19 the proper subject of Rule 703 reliance. Dr. Cragg did not cite to or purport to rely upon either the
 20 underlying studies (“An economic assessment of the effects of Apple’s License Agreement with
 21 Spotify”) or the data produced during the studies. These submissions were—as far as Apple can discern
 22 without the benefit of a sponsoring witness—prepared for the purpose of persuading the JFTC to take
 23 action against Apple, and include [REDACTED]
 24 [REDACTED]

25 Advocacy documents submitted to a regulator urging legal action against a competitor are not
 26 the kind of documents that “experts in the particular field would reasonably rely on.” Fed. R. Evid.
 27 703. It is well settled that the Federal Rules of Evidence “do not permit an expert to rely upon excerpts
 28 from opinions developed by another expert for the purposes of litigation.” *In re Imperial Credit Indus.*,

1 *Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 252 F. Supp. 2d 1005, 1012 (C.D. Cal. 2003); *see also Fosmire v. Progressive Max Ins.*
 2 *Co.*, 277 F.R.D. 625, 630 (W.D. Wash. 2011) (“The rules do not permit an expert to rely upon opinions
 3 developed by another expert for purposes of litigation without independent verification of the
 4 underlying expert’s work.”). That reasoning surely applies with double force to advocacy drafted not
 5 by an expert in the relevant field, but by a competitor with a business interest in a particular outcome.
 6 *Cf. Dugas v. 3M Co.*, No. 14-CV-1096, 2016 WL 3966142, at *6 (M.D. Fla. June 30, 2016) (“[A]s a
 7 piece drafted for the advocacy of a particular position, it is not the type of objective scientific evidenced
 8 contemplated by Rule 803(18) or Rule 703.”). The Spotify submissions are not scientific evidence—
 9 they are advocacy, created by a competitor, for the purpose of attacking Apple. And Dr. Cragg cannot
 10 credibly testify that experts in his field rely on submissions made to regulators for the purpose of
 11 influencing the outcome. Tellingly, Dr. Cragg did not request or consider Apple’s *response* to Spotify’s
 12 JFTC submissions in reaching any of his opinions; if he had, consideration of competing regulatory
 13 submissions would quickly devolve into a trial-within-a-trial on which there has been neither discovery
 14 nor notice. Epic’s attempt to cloud the record with information from a one-sided submission of a
 15 non-party to a regulator should be rejected outright.

16 Dr. Cragg’s reliance on third-party advocacy is particularly dubious because the actual *studies*
 17 on which Dr. Cragg purports to rely have not been produced in this litigation. Rather, Dr. Cragg has
 18 cited to summaries of that study prepared by Spotify for submission to the JFTC. Apple’s counsel has
 19 searched its production files and found just *one* relevant [REDACTED] commissioned by
 20 Spotify, which relates [REDACTED]. *See* Decl. of R. Brass. But the Spotify submissions on which
 21 Dr. Cragg relied refer to studies conducted [REDACTED] for which Apple has found no
 22 underlying data. And Dr. Cragg is not simply relying on the Spotify submissions in the course of
 23 forming and offering an opinion, but instead is using the submissions “as substantive evidence of his
 24 ultimate conclusions.” *Turner v. Burlington N. Santa Fe R.R. Co.*, 338 F.3d 1058, 1062 (9th Cir. 2003)
 25 (affirming exclusion of expert testimony “in the absence of foundation testimony by the laboratory that
 26 conducted the testing”); *see also In re Taxotere (Docetaxel) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 16-MDL-2740,
 27 2019 WL 3817658, at *2 n.19 (E.D. La. Aug. 14, 2019) (“In order for an expert to base his opinion on
 28 a study it is necessary that he be able to testify of his own knowledge as to the nature and extent of the

1 source from which statistics were gathered.” (quotation marks omitted)). Dr. Cragg’s written testimony
 2 leaves little doubt as to that fact. *See* Ex. Expert 13 ¶ 71 (Cragg). And because Epic did not subpoena
 3 a witness from Spotify to testify—and because Dr. Cragg did not disclose his reliance on the Spotify
 4 submissions until he served his written direct testimony on April 28, well after his deposition—Apple
 5 has no opportunity to test whether the advocacy papers Spotify submitted to the JFTC reflect reliable
 6 and accurate data . Nor did Dr. Cragg have that opportunity.

7 To be clear, Apple believes that the Spotify “[REDACTED]” has serious and significant flaws.
 8 Apple addressed these flaws in materials that are not part of the record of this case, for the simple
 9 reason that all of this is so far beyond the scope of Epic’s complaint that it was not even the subject of
 10 discovery. A Sherman Act trial in California is not the place to decide the merits or reliability of
 11 advocacy submissions to foreign regulators. This exercise is simply a sideshow that should be excised
 12 from the trial record.

13 For these reasons, the Spotify submissions are not the type of evidence on which experts in Dr.
 14 Cragg’s field would rely upon and cannot form the basis for any of his opinions. Dr. Cragg’s written
 15 and oral testimony relying on those submissions should be stricken, and the submissions themselves
 16 disregarded.

17
 18 DATED: May 14, 2021

By /s/ Rachel S. Brass
 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
 Theodore J. Boutrous Jr.
 Richard J. Doren
 Daniel G. Swanson
 Mark A. Perry
 Veronica S. Lewis
 Cynthia E. Richman
 Jay P. Srinivasan
 Ethan D. Dettmer
 Rachel Brass

Attorneys for Apple Inc.